

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Geography, Environment, and Earth Science International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JGEESI_120861
Title of the Manuscript:	ADDRESSING ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE-RELATED DISASTERS IN GROWING AND EMERGING SETTLEMNTS – A REVIEW OF LOCAL CLIMATE ADAPTATION EFFORTS IN NIGERIAN COSMOPOLITAN CITIES
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. Authors must write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	THE TOPIC IS FINE	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	IT IS OKAY	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	THE ABSTRACT IS NOT SHOWING THE GAP AND THE OUTCOME OF THE REVIEW	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	NO NEED TO HAVE MANY PARTIES SCATTERED, CAN THE AUTHOR PUT TOGETHER ALL THE PARTIES IN THE INTRODUCTION: THE STATEMENT PROBLEM, REVIEW, ...	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	THE PAPER DIDN'T SHOW ANY IMPLICATION OF THIS REVIEW TO FILL THE GAP	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention in the review form.	NO, THE REFERENCES ARE NOT SUFFICIENT BECAUSE THIS PAPER IS A PAPER REVIEW, IT SHOULD HAVE A LOT OF REFERENCES INDEED	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	THERE SOME SMALL GRAMMAR MISTAKES THAT SHOULD BE CORRECTED	
Optional/General comments	SOME TABLES ARE MENTIONED WITHOUT ANY REFERENCES, ...	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mupenge Mutiyamuogo Parfait
Department, University & Country	Universite Officielle De Bukavu, DR Congo, China University of Geosciences, China